

U.S. Rep. Charles Stenholm, a former all-state end for Wood at Stamford. Sometimes he just writes to correct mistakes of any nature.

He'd write Gailey, he says, but he's not sure it would do any good. He pulls out a sheet of paper and diagrams his trademark play, the power pitch. Any team that wanted to beat his, he says, first had to stop the power pitch. They'd run it 20 times a game and never fumble.

Here's why the Cowboys fumble, he says, whether it's Tony Dorsett or Emmitt Smith: Coaches teach the running back to run at an angle toward the line of scrimmage before taking the pitch. Wood says they should have backs run parallel with the line, which would better allow them to catch the pitch, then square their shoulders before they hit the hole.

But wouldn't the Cowboys argue that a back gets to the hole faster if he runs at an angle?

"Might be quicker to the hole," Wood says tersely, his eyes returning to the field, "but you aren't gonna get to the hole with the ball."

He stares straight ahead.

"Just a fundamental mistake," he mutters. "S'all there is to it."

Asked his favorite college coaches, he immediately cites Texas Tech's Spike Dykes and Texas' Mack Brown. He is intrigued by Oklahoma's comeback under Bob Stoops, he's impressed by Kansas State Bill Snyder, and he's a great friend of Florida State's Bobby Bowden.

In his 1992 book, "Gordon Wood's Game Plan to Winning Football," he lists 36 coaches who have contributed to his beliefs, ranging from former assistants to Bo Schembechler, W.T. Staple, Gene Stallings and a high school coach from Ohio named Bron Bacevich.

Wood's education in football seems funny, considering how he started. His father was a farmer outside Abilene who didn't believe a man needed much in the way of schooling.

"If you get to third grade and can read and write," A.V. Wood told his eight children, "you're wasting your time going to college. You'll just be a teacher or preacher, and you'll starve."

Gordon Wood was the only one of A.V.'s four sons to earn a high school diploma. He went on to Hardin-Simmons and never starved. But he didn't get rich, either. The most he ever made coaching and teaching, he says, was \$42,000. He had an offer in the '50s to be an assistant coach at Texas Tech, but he didn't like the travel required in recruiting.

He and Katharine, who reared a son and daughter, live in a little three-bedroom house just two blocks from the high school, the same place they've lived since the early '60s, two doors down from Southhall. The day that Wood retired, he fulfilled a promise to himself when he bought a luxury car and the best golf cart he could find.

He drove the car into the garage, and Katharine told him it was nice. She also told him she'd never ride in it.

"There are too many hungry people in this town," she told her husband.

So he took the car back. He listens to Katharine, as long as she's not trying to send in a couple of new plays. He says he probably would have coached one more year, but she insisted that he retire, and he reluctantly agreed.

"It was time for me to quit," he says.

He sounds sincere. But he still has a radio program on Thursday evenings to talk about high school football, still has coffee with friends to talk about it. He watches it on television, reads about it in newspapers, visits coaches and players.

And, nearly every week, he goes to a game. "I enjoy watching," he says. "I really do."

Most of the time, anyway. With five minutes left in the Joshua game, he gets up to leave the press box and beat the rush. Brownwood is up, 35-6, and sitting on Joshua's goal line.

At one of the exits, he says to hold up a second. "Let's see if they score," he says.

As if on cue, a Brownwood player is flagged for illegal motion.

"Aw, crap," Wood says, and turns for the parking lot.

Mistakes kill him, and always did. "I'd die if we had two or three penalties a game," he says.

Mistakes kill him, but he says he didn't make one by staying at Brownwood all those years. Katharine had put it in perspective earlier. "You take Tom Landry and Spike Dykes and Grant Teaff and Hayden Fry," she said. "They're all great coaches, but they were all just kids who played high school football in Texas."

And Gordon Wood was a Texas high school football coach, the best ever, his peers say.

Even an old perfectionist couldn't beat that.

"I wouldn't change anything," he says softly, sitting in his driveway in his sensible sedan. "No."

HONORING RONALD R. ROGERS AS HE IS INSTALLED AS GRAND MASTER OF THE GRAND LODGE OF FREE AND ACCEPTED MASONS IN OHIO

HON. ROB PORTMAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1999

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ronald R. Rogers, a constituent, who recently became Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons for 1999-2000.

Mr. Rogers has an extensive Masonic record. He began his Masonic career as Master Councilor of Ivanhoe Chapter of the Order of DeMolay. He received his Chavalier Degree in 1952 and was awarded the Active Legion of Honor in 1976. He became a Master Mason in Norwood Lodge No. 576 in 1972. Before becoming Grand Master, Mr. Rogers was elected Junior Grand Warden in 1996, Senior Grand Warden in 1997, and Deputy Grand Master in 1998.

A Cincinnati native, Mr. Rogers is a graduate of Norwood High School and received his B.A. from the University of Cincinnati. He worked for Clayton L. Scroggins, a management consulting firm in Cincinnati, for 35 years. Mr. Rogers is the proud father of a daughter, Robin, and the proud grandfather of a granddaughter, Leslie.

Active in his community, Mr. Rogers is a member of the Forest Chapel United Methodist Church. He has served Forest Chapel as Chairman of Finance, Chairman of Music and a member of the Administrative Board. He sang in the Forest Chapel Chancel Choir and also served as its president. Mr. Rogers is a past Area Financial Officer of United Way and past President of the Forest Park Band Boosters.

We congratulate Ronald Rogers on his position as Grand Master, and wish him every success during his tenure.

COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE COMPETITION AND PRIVATIZATION ACT OF 1999

SPEECH OF

HON. TOM BLILEY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1999

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3261. I am pleased that today we will pass on suspension in bipartisan fashion our satellite reform and privatization legislation, H.R. 3261. The fact that we will pass this decisively and that no one has indicated he or she will vote against this bill indicates the widespread support in the House for this legislation. It is high time to end the current cartel-like ownership and management structure of INTELSAT and Inmarsat. They must not only be privatized, they must be privatized in a pro-competitive market. We must eliminate their privileges and immunities, warehoused orbital locations or frequencies, and limit their ability to use their governmental privileges to expand their services and assets pending privatization. There is no reason for government to be providing commercial communications services. We must also replace monopoly control with competition and provide full direct access in the United States to INTELSAT and Inmarsat.

As the author and manager of this legislation, I think it is important to specify what will be the legislative history for H.R. 3261. With the exception of section 641, the deletion of old section 642, the addition of section 649, and several date related changes, H.R. 3261 is identical to the bill the House passed on May 6, 1998, H.R. 1872. We have put this legislation on the suspension calendar because Members already voted for the same text year by a margin of 403 to 16. Because most of the bill is identical to last year's bill, it is unnecessary to go through the Committee hearing and report process again this year. Thus, no report will be filed with H.R. 3261. Instead, we intend that the Committee report for H.R. 1872 (See House Rpt. 105-494), the record for the legislative hearing held on September 30, 1997, and the floor debate on H.R. 1872, in relevant part, be used as legislative history for H.R. 3261.

What follows is a specific discussion of changes that have been made in H.R. 3261 when compared to H.R. 1872, which, when taken together with the H.R. 1872 legislative history discussed above, will serve as the legislative history for H.R. 3261.

Section 601(b)(1) advances the dates for the privatization of INTELSAT and Inmarsat, respectively, from January 1, 2002 to April 1, 2001, for INTELSAT, and from January 1, 2001 to April 1, 2000, for Inmarsat. The reason for this change is that it has become clear that the long transition periods provided in H.R. 1872 are no longer necessary. Both organizations have taken some steps toward some form of privatization. For example, Inmarsat moved to end its intergovernmental status, although it still has not proceeded with an initial public offering of its stock. Moreover, the INTELSAT Assembly of Parties announced some steps which could move INTELSAT in the direction of privatization.

Section 602(a)(1)(A) and section 621(1) also have been changed to reflect the new dates set out in section 601(b)(1). Similarly, the

dates set out in 603(b) for the Federal Communications Commission to make annual findings and report to Congress on INTELSAT's progress toward privatization have been advanced to reflect the fact that longer transition periods are not needed. Thus, the first Commission finding is required on or before January 1, 2000.

Furthermore, given the fact that over a year has elapsed since passage of H.R. 1872, the number of annual findings has been reduced from four to three, with the second finding of H.R. 1872 now included in the first annual finding, as set out in section 603(b)(2). The last finding is due January 1, 2002, which is later than the April 1, 2001 date established for INTELSAT privatization. It may be appropriate to make the FCC finding date the same as the privatization date of April 1, 2001 at the next stage in the legislative process.

Finally, there have been changes in the dates by which the privatized INTELSAT and Inmarsat must conduct initial public offerings of their shares; from January 1, 2001 to April 1, 2001 for INTELSAT, and from January 1, 2000 to April 1, 2000 for Inmarsat.

Section 624 deals specifically with Inmarsat. While there already have been some changes in the Inmarsat structure and some provisions of this section may need to be adjusted, such as the reference to the Inmarsat Signatory, this section is still applicable. While Inmarsat has conducted what it deems to be a privatization, that privatization has not been conducted in a pro-competitive manner.

Section 641 of H.R. 3261 ends the monopoly of COMSAT over access to the U.S. market for INTELSAT services. The Commission is to comply with section 641, by adopting orders ensuring the full implementation of all forms of direct access as provided in section 641(a).

Section 641 of H.R. 1872 dealt with various issues raised by ending COMSAT's exclusive access to INTELSAT and Inmarsat. We do not believe it necessary for the new section 641 to address these issues. First, given the changes at Inmarsat, and the provisions of other parts of the legislation dealing with Inmarsat, such as section 624(1), there is no need to specify direct access to Inmarsat in the new section 641. Second, it is appropriate to permit both non-investment, or contract, direct access (also known as Level 3) and investment (also known as Level 4) direct access to INTELSAT immediately upon the effective date of this legislation. All such direct access is in the public interest. It will increase competition for access to INTELSAT services and lower prices for consumers of INTELSAT services.

The Commission currently has the authority to pursue contract or Level 3 direct access. As was the case with respect to H.R. 1872, by including provisions on direct access in H.R. 3261, we do not intend to imply that there is a need to amend any provision of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 to provide for direct access.

There are several other differences between H.R. 3261 and H.R. 1872 in section 641 regarding direct access. First, H.R. 3261 does not provide for or specifically authorize any signatory support costs. This is a change from H.R. 1872, which permitted compensation to INTELSAT signatories for support costs that the signatories would not otherwise be able to avoid under a direct access regime. Second, H.R. 3261 does not limit the ability of non-U.S.

signatories of INTELSAT to provide direct access in the United States. Thus the sections of H.R. 1872 dealing with signatory fees and foreign signatories, along with section 641(1)(A)(iii) regarding carrier pass through of savings realized as a result of direct access, were deleted.

H.R. 3261 does not grant the Commission authority to impose a signatory fee or limit direct access by foreign signatories nor should the statement indicating that the Commission has authority to implement direct access be interpreted as meaning that the Commission has the authority to impose signatory fee or limit direct access by foreign signatories.

New section 641 also does not direct the Commission to take action on COMSAT's petition to be treated as a non-dominant common carrier because the FCC already has acted on this petition. Furthermore, section 641(4), stating that direct access regulation would be eliminated after a pro-competitive privatization of INTELSAT or Inmarsat is achieved was unnecessary and thus was deleted.

H.R. 3261 does not include an equivalent of section 642 of H.R. 1872 dealing with the renegotiation of monopoly contracts, which is also known as "fresh look." The sections of H.R. 3261 following section 641 were renumbered to reflect the deletion of old section 642.

New section 649 is intended to prevent U.S.-licensed international carriers and satellite operators from using leverage they may have in foreign markets to exclude other U.S.-licensed international carriers and satellite operators from gaining access to those foreign markets. The effect of Section 649 is to apply this policy to all foreign satellite operators seeking to do business in the United States. Exclusive market access is a critical barrier to the provision of competitive satellite services by United States companies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

CONGRATULATING SOUTH GRAND PRAIRIE HIGH SCHOOL

HON. MARTIN FROST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1999

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate South Grand Prairie High for winning one of 13 New American High School awards from the Department of Education. This designation recognizes South Grand Prairie's tremendous efforts in raising academic standards and student achievement.

South Grand Prairie is a diverse high school of over 2,400 students. It reflects the changing demographics of the surrounding community, half of the student body comes from minority backgrounds. In 1996, South Grand Prairie undertook an extensive reform program to raise academic performance by the school's "middle majority," the large segment of the student body whose needs were not entirely being met. The high school created a full-academy model that incorporates Advanced Placement-level curricula with career-oriented programs.

Students at South Grand Prairie pursue a rigorous academic program in an area that best suits them—Business and Computer Technology, Creative and Performing Arts,

Health Science and Human Services, Humanities or Law, and Math, Science and Engineering. This allows students to raise their performance by capitalizing on their interests.

South Grand Prairie has enlisted the entire community in this effort. They have formed partnerships with local middle schools and area colleges. An Academic Advisory Board comprised of students, teachers, and prominent local business and industry leaders, has been formed to develop a curriculum and assessments of the program. And the Chamber of Commerce participates in a teacher-shadowing program which allows educators to understand the skills needed in the vocational areas in which they are teaching.

The results of this innovative program have been remarkable. South Grand Prairie has raised its students passage rate on Texas' state math exam by 18 percent. South Grand Prairie students pass the state's reading test at a 24 percent higher rate than the state average, and the school has higher SAT scores and rates of college enrollment than the state's average.

Clearly, South Grand Prairie's academic reforms have been a success, the school is highly deserving of the New American High School award. If South Grand Prairie represents the future in American education, the future looks bright indeed. Congratulations to Principal Roy Garcia and all of South Grand Prairie's students, faculty, and parents. Your school is a model for all of America's high schools and you have made North Texas proud. I am pleased to be able to join South Grand Prairie officials at their White House award ceremony this Friday.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 5TH ANNUAL COVENANT HOUSE WASHINGTON CANDLELIGHT VIGIL

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1999

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Covenant House Candlelight Vigil, where I will speak on Tuesday, December 4, 1999. The Vigil is a national event held every year in early December in some 20 cities across the country. The Candlelight Vigil symbolizes community hope for the well being of all our children and highlights the plight of homeless, runaway, and at-risk children.

The Vigil in Washington alone has 3,000 concerned adults and youth marching, bearing candles and flashlights in support of youth. They will march shoulder to shoulder for a quarter of a mile to the Covenant House Washington Community Service Center, setting a tone of joy, solidarity, commitment, and hope. Similar rallies are held simultaneously at Covenant House sites across the country.

Since its inception in 1995, Covenant House Washington has invested over \$13 million of private funding in our youth. They have given hundreds of youth a hand up by providing food, shelter, tutoring, life skills, job training, legal representation, and positive recreational opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring Covenant House Washington and their commitment to our most vulnerable young people and in recognizing the 1999 Covenant House Washington Candlelight Vigil.